

28. General Wilson said the substantive Presidential intelligence objectives for FY-1976 were essentially an NIO document, with inputs from a number of sources---major among which would be the comments of the Working Group. He invited comments.

29. Mr. Ellsworth said he had a number of specific suggestions, mainly relating to more detailed guidance to meet planning needs of the Office of the Secretary of Defense. He submitted a set of written comments, and then noted that, in general, these comments requested that all material relating to the USSR be combined in a single objective, that specific reference be made to the need for intelligence on decision making in the Soviet Union, that weight be given to intelligence on the Middle East, that there be specific mention of Spain and Portugal, that nuclear proliferation and CW/BW be addressed, and that attention be given to Soviet knowledge of U.S. and Allied negotiating positions affecting SALT, LTBT, and MBFR.

30. General Wilson recognized the validity of these points, but wondered whether they might more properly be KIQs.

31. Mr. Ellsworth said he felt the objectives paper would be improved if it became more concrete and less vague in nature.

32. Mr. Morell said he shared the general thrust of Mr. Ellsworth's comments. On economic matters, he felt oil and the recycling issue should be addressed separately. In his view, Portugal, the Middle East, oil and recycling were all buried in Objectives 5 and 6, which he described as "catch alls." He said he would be more comfortable if Dr. [REDACTED] submitted the economic items.

33. Mr. Brown said he had struggled with the problem of relating objectives and KIQs and that State preferred to focus on the KIQs. Enlargement of the objectives list would involve a large number of "e.g.'s." State had organizational problems in preparing its comments, but he was more concerned with packaging aspects of the objectives than with their substantive content.

34. Mr. Ober said the NSC staff did not object to the general nature of the Objectives, accepted the format, and expected to focus primarily on the KIQs. He said he would specify word changes for the Objectives.

6
~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

Approved For Release 2000/08/30 : CIA-RDP80B01500R000200150004-3

35. Mr. Walsh said that if a general list, such as the present Objectives, was tailored to become a "want list" of everyone, it would lose its value. He preferred keeping the Objectives general, using the KIQs for matters of detail.

25X6A 36. RADM Hilton questioned what was meant by "security" in Objectives 1, 3 and 5. If the word meant "military," it should be so stated. He would put all the Soviet items in one objective, and the PRC items in one. He wondered how [REDACTED] should be treated. Though much of the needed material comes from open sources and the countries are traditionally friendly, they could well be intelligence targets.

37. General Wilson said "security" and "defense" were synonymous, and this would be clarified. He said the comments made at the meeting would be provided the personnel who would redraft the objectives and he would ensure the Group was kept current on developments.

38. VADM Rectanus said the comments he had provided Mr. Ellsworth related primarily to re-formatting although there were several specific additions to the list.

39. RADM Hilton wondered why "strategic" was singled out in Objective 4, when what seemed to be meant was "military."

40. Mr. Ober said the NSC staff was interested in getting something on the leadership in China into the list.

41. General Wilson said he would be back in touch with the Group if any real problems arose in revision of the Objectives. Mr. Ober added that he would run the OSD comments through the NSC staff.

42. General Wilson commented that the Resource Management Objectives for FY-1976 relate to the substantive objectives, but address different problems. He noted there was close collaboration in resource matters between the DCI and the ASD(I).

43. Mr. Ellsworth suggested that the DCI task himself to survey the response of users to intelligence products, and Mr. Morell said he strongly supported this. He noted this had been discussed at the USIB, and Dr. Proctor had made the point that procedures are in use to check with consumers. RADM Hilton said he thought this would be part of the Working Group action program.

~~SECRET~~

Approved For Release 2000/08/30 : CIA-RDP80B01500R000200150004-3

44. The Admiral also noted that not all of the resource management objectives related to resource management. In No. 5, he suggested that "provide" be changed to "coordinate."

45. Mr. Walsh said there was a difference between the DCI responsibility to "provide" something and his coordination role. As regards No. 5 (which relates to responding to Presidential and Congressional reviews and investigations), the DCI must be in a position to "provide" the data.

46. Mr. Brown said this raised a problem, since in his view Congressional investigators would not accept indirect Community responses.

47. Mr. Walsh (after re-reading the objective) said that "coordinate" would not bother him.

48. Mr. Morell noted that No. 3 addressed "foreign economic intelligence guidance," but did not address political or military intelligence guidance.

49. General Wilson said the specific items under Objective No. 3 were those which had "burbled" to the top. The list was not meant to be all inclusive, but to highlight undertakings on which focus would be given.

50. Copies of the FY-1975 KIQs were provided members of the Group for reference, and Mr. Ellsworth said Defense would like a month to review the FY-1976 KIQs when the draft is circulated.

Agenda Item 4: DCI Perspectives for Intelligence, 1976-1981

51. General Wilson noted that the draft before the Group included only Parts I and II of the Perspectives. Part III is still being written, and the DCI has asked that a Part IV be added to "take a 20-year bite." This poses difficult problems, but since technical systems now being evaluated will have a long life, it is important that a look be made far into the future so the Community does not acquire capabilities which will not be useful after 1981.

52. VADM Rectanus commented that 20-year forecasts are being made in other areas, without the benefit of an intelligence input.

53. General Wilson asked whether the major areas of concern to Group members were reflected in the draft, which had been prepared by the Intelligence Community Staff and was still under review by the NIOs. The "Perspectives" is a DCI paper, but at this stage is open to change.

54. Mr. Ellsworth submitted some written comments and said he considered the draft so general it provided only broad orientation with respect to the USSR, PRC and [REDACTED]

25X6A

25X6A [REDACTED] He thought it would be helpful to have a clear statement of the need of intelligence on decision making in foreign governments. The paper made no mention of the need to understand the workings of foreign governments. He felt there was need for more attention in the document in areas such as the Middle East, Persian Gulf and Southeast Asia. Also, attention should be given to important functional areas, such as nuclear proliferation and arms trade. Mr. Ellsworth also said it would be useful if the DCI would disseminate a paper indicating the review cycle and draft schedule for his planning and guidance documents.

55. Mr. Brown asked what review the Perspectives document went through. He said there was objection in State to one or another of the paragraphs. He asked whether the paper represented a distillation of Community products or was a CIA view of the world. General Thomas explained the "Perspectives" was not a direct distillation from existing estimates. It was written in the Intelligence Community Staff, coordinated with the NIOs, then submitted to USIB for coordination and, after DCI approval, submitted to the NSCIC for review.

56. Mr. Brown said he was still in the process of obtaining responses in State, but that some of the statements send State officers "up the wall."

57. General Wilson invited submission of the State comments.

58. Mr. Walsh said that the Perspectives represent a "new art form" and the mechanics to date may have been faulty. He welcomed the idea of a considerable number of people carefully reviewing the draft.

59. VADM Rectanus asked if it was again intended the "Perspectives" would be submitted to the NSCIC, and General Wilson affirmed this. Mr. Walsh noted, however, that by then it is too late to do much about changing the paper.

60. General Wilson admitted the Group was addressing the paper while it was still in rough form, but this was being done in the interest of obtaining substantive suggestions at a time when they could best be used.

61. RADM Hilton said that if the "Perspectives" are the DCI's views as head of the Intelligence Community, they should reflect the views of the Community. General Wilson replied that the paper is considered by the USIB, and he noted that last year the NSCIC passed the "Perspectives" to the Working Group to see if any policy issues could be identified.

62. Mr. Ober said the paper seemed overly pessimistic, and he wondered how much time was available for its review. He said that two weeks was not enough to permit full consideration in the NSC staff. He asked if informal communication with the NIOs could be used as a means of providing inputs.

25X1A9a 63. [REDACTED] said the DCI wanted the "Perspectives" out by the end of March, but General Wilson commented that it might be possible to back this off.

64. Mr. Brown asked who was reviewing the paper other than the Working Group. Mr. Morell replied that the paper was really moving along two tracks--the Working Group and the USIB arena. He thought only one or the other should be used, but RADM Hilton commented that Mr. Morell was the only member of the Working Group who sat on the USIB. RADM Hilton felt that the fact the Group had been reconstituted as a "users group" was proof of the need for a users' input.

65. General Wilson described the "Perspectives" as the DCI's personal document, in which he expressed himself on matters with which he is concerned. The USIB principals respond on the paper to the DCI as their chairman. In addition the paper will go to the NSCIC via the Working Group. General Wilson admitted this is not "a clean and tidy process," but the Working Group had an opportunity to make the document as useful as possible.

66. RADM Hilton noted a semantic problem in that in one place the PRC is described as the "second most important" intelligence target, and in another place [REDACTED] is described as "most important next to the USSR." He felt it would be useful to include something on the impact of nuclear proliferation and nuclear power. He also considered terrorism was treated as an isolated event, but that sometimes it is a multi-country coordinated threat. 25X6A

67. Mr. Morell asked how much time was available to comment, and would the Group meet again to consider the paper. General Wilson said he would speak with the DCI and be back to the members by telephone.

Agenda Item 5: Report by the Chairman on a Proposed Work Program for the Group

68. Copies of General Wilson's memorandum, "Proposed Program for the Working Group," were distributed. The General said this was a preliminary thrust, aimed at pertinent and feasible selections in the context of the NSCIC charter. He described the program as consisting of action projects, informational papers and briefings.

69. He noted that action is under way in the Intelligence Community Staff to prepare all four of the information papers described in the memorandum. He said the fourth paper would be accompanied by a briefing. (These four are: "Handbook on the U.S. Intelligence Community;" "Consumer Contact Points with Production Elements of the Intelligence Community;" "The DCI's 'Family' of Intelligence Guidance Documents;" and "The Problem of Expressing Uncertainty in Intelligence Estimates.")

70. Only brief comments were made on the four proposed action projects.

a. Comments on Key Intelligence Questions for FY-1976

General Wilson said the NIOs were using the FY-1975 KIQs as the base list for FY-1976 KIQs so a review of the 1975 listing would provide a foundation for addressing the 1976 KIQs, which are expected to be available from the NIOs for review by the Group about 15 May.